

Remarks

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-mentioned Official Action in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 15, 17, 19, 21 and 23 are now pending in the application, with Claims 1, 6, 12 and 17 being independent. Claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 20 and 22 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 15, 17, 19 and 21 have been amended and Claim 23 has been added herein.

Initially, Applicants once again request that the Examiner consider the documents cited in the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement filed June 7, 2002, by initialing and returning the Information Disclosure Citation form (Form PTO-1449) provided therewith. A copy of that Form PTO-1449 is included herewith for the Examiner's convenience.

The Office Action Summary indicates that the specification and drawings were objected to. At page 2, the Office Action states that Applicants' cooperation is requested in correcting any noted errors in the specification and drawings. It should be noted, however, that a substitute specification was filed on January 21, 2004, and a corrected formal drawing was filed on August 15, 2003. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the specification and drawings are requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 11-13, 15, 17, 18 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,163,153 (Cole et al.). Claims 3, 5, 14 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Cole et al. in view of

European Patent Application No. 0 782 924 (Kanbayashi et al.). Claims 8, 9, 19 and 20 were rejected under § 103 as being unpatentable over Cole et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,262,872 (Yoshimura et al.). Claims 10 and 21 were rejected under § 103 as being unpatentable over Cole et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,428,379 (Kaneko et al.). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Cole et al. relates to a method and apparatus for configuring a computer in a low-power mode. In the flowchart of Fig. 1A, depicting a method for entering the low-power mode, an NMI-suspend routine is performed at step 240. As understood by Applicants, a standby handler executed by a CPU prohibits receipt of an NMI interrupt.

However, this subroutine in Cole et al. does not perform such that a user logic circuit and a mask signal generating portion are set to prohibit the NMI interrupt, and then a capping operation of the recording head is executed if discriminated that a power supply status flag is ON, and the user logic circuit and the mask signal generating portion are set to cancel prohibition of the NMI interrupt after the capping operation is completed, and then setting is made to shift to a mode for reducing the power consumption, as is recited in independent Claim 1.

Nor does this subroutine in Cole et al. perform the steps of setting a user logic circuit and a mask signal generating portion to prohibit the NMI interrupt, discriminating a power supply status flag retained on non-volatile memory means, causing execution of a capping operation of the recording head if discriminated that the power supply status flag is ON, setting the user logic circuit and the mask signal generating

portion to cancel the NMI interrupt prohibition, and shifting the operational mode of the CPU to the mode for reducing power consumption, as is recited in independent Claim 12.

Cole et al. also does not disclose or suggest at least generating a first voltage to be supplied to a CPU and a power switching means and a second voltage to be supplied to a motor, detecting an abnormality of the second voltage and outputting an abnormality signal, outputting a trigger signal based on a signal from the CPU, receiving the trigger signal to generate an NMI interrupt mask signal, and executing a logic operation with the mask signal and the abnormality signal, with a signal from power switching means being made invalid if an abnormality is detected, as is recited in independent Claims 6 and 17.

Thus, Cole et al. fails to disclose or suggest important features of the present invention recited in the independent claims.

Kanbayashi et al. relates to an ink jet recording device with a drive voltage generation circuit. A power supply OFF timer 38 is used to delay interrupting supply of main power to the recording device to allow time for capping device 8 to seal the recording head. Kanbayashi et al., however, does not disclose or suggest prohibiting an NMI interrupt, and cancelling prohibition of the NMI interrupt after a capping operation is completed. Nor does Kanbayashi et al. disclose or suggest making a signal from a power switching means invalid if an abnormality of a second voltage supplied to a motor is detected. Accordingly, Kanbayashi et al. fails to remedy the deficiencies of Cole et al. noted above with respect to the independent claims.

Yoshimura et al. describes an image forming apparatus with means for error detection. The apparatus includes a temperature sensor and can determine a temperature

abnormality based on a table. At col. 27, lines 28-39, Yoshimura et al. describes head voltage adjustment when a recording head is replaced. However, it is respectfully submitted that this head voltage adjustment cannot be construed as detecting abnormality of a voltage supplied to a motor. Nor does Yoshimura et al. describe executing a logic operation with a mask signal and an abnormality signal. Accordingly, Yoshimura et al. also fails to remedy the deficiencies of the citations noted above with respect to the independent claims.

Kaneko et al. was cited by the Examiner for teaching the use of an electrothermal recording head, but is not believed to add anything further to the citations discussed above.

Thus, independent Claims 1, 6, 12 and 17 are patentable over the citations of record. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections are respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention is patentably defined by independent Claims 1, 6, 12 and 17. Dependent Claims 4, 8, 10, 15, 19, 21 and 23 are also allowable, in their own right, for defining features of the present invention in addition to those recited in their respective independent claims.

Individual consideration of the dependent claims is requested.

Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowability are requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Mark A. Williamson", with a horizontal line underneath.

Attorney for Applicants
Mark A. Williamson
Registration No. 33,628

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
MAW\mt

DC_MAIN 171047v1